INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

2007-2008 COMPLIANCE AND ON-SITE MONITORING REPORT
FOR:

Ahead of the Class Services (formerly Spectra Services)

DOCUMENT ANALYSIS		OBSERVATION		COMPLIANCE	
Tutor Qualifications	*Unsatisfactory*	Lesson matches original description	*2 Approaching Standard*	Criminal Background Checks	*Non Compliance*
Recruiting Materials	*Unsatisfactory*	Instruction is clear	*2 Approaching Standard*	Health/safety laws & regulations	*Non Compliance*
Academic Program	*Unsatisfactory*	Time on task is appropriate	*2.5 Between approaching and meeting standard*	Financial viability	*In Compliance*
Progress Reporting	*Unsatisfactory*	Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable	*2.5 Between approaching and meeting standard*		
Assessment and Individual Program Design	*Unsatisfactory*	Student/instructor ratio: 4-8:1	*3 Meets Standard*		

Ahead of the Class Services (formerly Spectra Services) is placed on probation for the 2008-2009 school year due to concerns regarding the onsite monitoring visit and submitted documentation as detailed in the enclosed monitoring report. As such, Ahead of the Class Services (formerly Spectra Services) has been required to implement corrective actions to address all areas of concern.

NAME OF PROVIDER: Ahead of the Class Services (formerly Spectra Services)   **DATE DOCUMENTATION RECEIVED:** March 13, 2008
REVIEWER: S.T.

Providers are required to submit documentation for each component during the site visit. If documentation is not available on-site, the director or head of the provider's organization, the site director, or another authorized representative will be required to submit documentation to the IDOE within seven (7) calendar days of site visit completion. **Failure to submit evidence could result in removal from the approved provider list.** Providers will be given an Unsatisfactory or Satisfactory for each component. Providers receiving an Unsatisfactory for any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report.

COMPONENT	DOCUMENTATION NEEDED	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE use only)	UNSATISFACTORY	SATISFACTORY	COMMENTS
Tutor qualifications	**BOTH** of the following: -Tutor resumes/applications (all tutors) -Documentation of professional development opportunities in which tutors have participated (i.e. sign-sheets, agendas, presentations, certificates of completion, etc.) *In addition to:* **ONE** of the following: -Tutor evaluations (all tutors) -Recruiting policy for tutors (one copy) -Sample tutor contract (one copy)	-Training agenda and Orientation PowerPoint -Tutor Applications -Tutor recruitment flyer -Tutor time sheets	X		-Tutor qualifications listed on tutor recruitment flyer are in line with provider's application; -Tutor assistant position description states assistants will offer instruction. However, as per IDOE Policies and Procedures for SES Subpart B Section 2.4, tutor assistants who do not meet minimum tutor qualifications are not permitted to provide instruction to students; -Documentation that tutors completed professional development training was provided for only one of the provider's locations; -Provider's application states that tutors are provided two weeks of professional development prior to tutoring and that ongoing professional development will be provided (also stated in recruitment brochure) in addition to stating tutors will receive training on "strategies for instruction and remediation...use of technology for instruction, assessment, data management and communication"; however, documentation does not verify tutors receive training beyond the initial orientation training. -At least one tutor observed working with students does not meet the provider's or IDOE's minimum tutor qualifications.

COMPONENT	DOCUMENTATION NEEDED	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE use only)	UNSATISFACTORY	SATISFACTORY	COMMENTS
Recruiting materials	**TWO** of the following: -Advertising or recruitment fliers -Incentives policy -Program description for parents	-Recruitment flyer -Recruitment brochure and program description for parents	X		-Information on recruitment flyer is not entirely accurate. For instance, the flyer states tutors are certified instructors which indicates tutors are state certified teachers or have received certification in some area, however, based on provider's amendment to the application and also tutor applications, tutors are not always certified teachers and some tutors have no certifications. In addition, the flyer states that small group instruction will be provided, when based on observations and provider's amendment, typically large group instruction is provided. Lastly, the flyer states students receive a minimum of 40 hours of tutoring. Based on the SES Agreements that were submitted for two school districts, students in one school district receive approximately 28 hours of tutoring while students in another district receive 33 hours of tutoring.
Academic Program	**ONE** of the following: -Lesson plan(s) for the observed tutoring session(s) and for each subject in which provider tutors *In addition to:* **ONE** of the following: -Specific connections to Indiana standards (cite exact IN standard to which lesson connects) -Description of connections to curriculum of EACH district the provider works with.	-Description of lessons from the A+ Learning System software program -Examples of A+ Learning System's connection to Indiana Academic Standards -Lesson plans -Connection to Indiana Academic Standards	X		-Description of student lessons on A+ Learning Systems computer based program is in line with provider application and in line with observed lessons; -Documentation demonstrates A+ Learning System lessons connection to Indiana Academic Standards. -Only a few tutors had a lesson plan available onsite. In addition, the lesson plans submitted for one site are very limited and vague in that they only state the general concept that will be covered during the lesson such as "Main Idea" or "Reading-Sequence and drawing conclusions" and do not share any other important details such as materials to be used, lesson objectives, when or if students will have guided practice, the timeframe for lessons, etc. Based on the brief lesson plans submitted, the concepts covered appear to connect to Indiana Academic Standards.
Progress Reporting	**ALL** of the following: -Progress reports (see IDOE e-mail for details regarding the request for progress reports) -Timeline for sending progress reports -Documentation of reports sent	-Progress report timeframe -Progress reports -SES Contracts and Agreements	X		- According to districts, progress reports are submitted to district staff in accordance to the timeframe (monthly) agreed to in SES Contracts. However, it does not appear that parents received progress reports in a timely manner as several students began their programs in January but only received one progress report between January and April; -Progress report timeline is in line with timeline stated in provider's SES Contracts with districts; -Progress reports are not consistent and some progress

					reports are not user friendly for parents. For instance, some progress reports are letters that include assessment results, lessons mastered and student strengths and areas in need of improvement while others are only charts listing assessment results and computer based assignments. In addition, the chart version of the progress report that lists assessment results and columns of assignments from the A+ computer program is not user friendly for parents as it is unclear how each item relates to student goals (no student goals are listed) and the long list of assignments with no comments or explanations could potentially be overwhelming to parents (due to the text heavy nature of the charts) and does not clarify to parents how their child has progressed. Also, the chart version of the progress report does not include any information on the progress the student has made in lessons that are not a part of the A+ computer based program (small group instruction, workbook lessons, etc.); -Not all progress reports have the same level of detail or required information (as per the IDOE memo on progress reports sent to providers in December 2007). All progress reports are missing the list of student goals from the SES Agreement and some progress reports are missing student strengths/areas in need of improvement, specific information regarding how students are improving their academic achievement, and a written statement that recommendations regarding how progress reports can be improved by contacting provider.
Assessment and Individual Program Design	**ALL** of the following: -Explanation of the process provider uses to develop Individual learning plans for each student - Pre-assessment scores and Individual learning plan for at least one student in each subject provider tutors (any identifying information for the student(s) must be blanked out) -Explanation and evidence regarding how provider's pre and post-test assessment correlates to Indiana academic standards.	-Explanation of learning plan development process -Pre-assessment scores -Explanation and evidence regarding assessments correlation to Indiana Academic Standards	**X**		- Learning plans and the description of the learning plan development process explains how the A+ Learning System develops learning plans for students, however, since A+ is only one portion of the provider's program the learning plans should also incorporate information from the portion of programming that is not computer based (i.e. small group instruction, workbook activities, etc.) or there should be a separate learning plan for the portion of the lesson that is not computer based. In addition, learning plans submitted are not long term plans mapping out each student's plan for the duration of the program (they only show the work completed by the student to date) and also do not include specific instructional strategies that will be used to help students achieve goals; -Description of assessment demonstrates connection to Indiana academic standards.

On-site Monitoring Rubric
OBSERVATION Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: Ahead of the Class Services (formerly Spectra Services)
SITE: New Light Community Development Center; Alexandria-Monroe Elementary
TUTOR'S INITIALS (ALL TUTORS OBSERVED): 4 tutors; J.L., Mrs. F, Computer lab
NUMBER OF LESSONS OBSERVED: 7

DATE: February 14, 2008; February 27, 2008
REVIEWER: S.T. & C.E.; S.T. & M.C.
TIME OF OBSERVATION: 4:05 p.m.; 3:30 p.m.

During the site visit, IDOE personnel will visit several tutoring sessions to observe lessons being provided. IDOE reviewers will be looking to see that actual tutoring matches lesson plan descriptions that are provided in requested documents, as well as those that were provided in the original provider application; that tutors and students are spending an appropriate amount of time on task; that instruction is clear and understandable; and that instructors seem knowledgeable about lesson content.

Each provider will receive a score of 1-4 points for each component. Providers receiving "1 or 2 points" on any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report. Failure to address deficiencies may result in removal from the state approved list.

COMPONENT	1 Below Standard	2 Approaching Standard	3 Meeting Standard	4 Exceeding Standard	REVIEWER COMMENTS
Lesson matches original description in provider application		X			-At one site students were observed to periodically transition from working on individually prescribed lessons on the computer using the A+ Learning System program to working on workbook pages that were assigned to students based on their pre-test scores. During the computer portion of the lesson, tutors interacted with each student while checking student progress. During the workbook portion of the lesson, tutors were observed providing primarily large group instruction to students by reviewing directions for language arts lessons, and providing instruction prior to encouraging students to work independently; -At another site students were observed to periodically transition from one station/activity to another throughout the tutoring session. In one station, students worked independently on workbook pages while the tutor periodically checked their progress. At a second station, students were supposed to be working on the computer on the A+ Learning System program (see details below). In a third station, students played a monopoly game with their tutor. Lastly, in a fourth station, students completed an activity on following directions during which each student was asked to read one of the steps in a list of instructions (the end result was a craft) and then were encouraged to read a book independently; -At one site, observed lessons were in line with the description in provider's application (i.e. computer based lessons from the A+ Learning Systems program, group instruction, activities from workbook pages etc.). At another site, some of the observed lessons were not in line with provider's application. For instance, during one lesson, students were observed playing monopoly. In addition to the fact that the use of board games was not described as an instructional strategy in the provider's application, the minimal level of instruction and lack of individualized instruction that students received during the game was not in line with the description in provider's application (see "Instruction is clear" section). At the same site, students in the computer lab who were supposed to be working on the A+ Learning System program were found playing non-educational internet games with very little supervision until the reviewers began recording the students' activities. The application states that during A+ Learning System computer time, "students are provided guidance by instructors, but are encouraged to work independently", however, the students were not observed receiving guidance/instruction from the substitute (which most likely led to them being off task) and it is unclear how long they had been allowed to play non-educational computer games. Lastly, at the same site, it was unclear in the lesson on following directions how having students read instructions for making a craft connected to individual student needs (while this may have filled a need for some students, it wasn't clear that all students benefited from exercise). The

5

					lesson's potential lack of a connection to individual student needs was further evident when the tutor was asked about each student's individual learning plan (which is described in the application as being used to help individualize instruction) and the tutor stated he/she did not know each students' goals and had not seen their individual learning plans.

COMPONENT	1 Below Standard	2 Approaching Standard	3 Meeting Standard	4 Exceeding Standard	REVIEWER COMMENTS
Instruction is clear		X			-At one site, students clearly understood the purpose of their lessons and the schedule of activities they would follow during the tutoring session. Tutors typically reviewed directions, and provided guidance/instruction prior to encouraging students to work independently. In addition, tutors provided more targeted instruction to students when it was clear they needed additional assistance with a concept; -At another site, students completing their lessons on workbook pages appeared to understand what was expected of them. The tutor leading this lesson checked in with each student to provide assistance and ensure they were on track in completing their lessons. However, at the same site, instruction was not always clear during other lessons. For instance, although it was assumed that the purpose of the lesson involving playing monopoly was to practice math skills (addition and subtraction of monetary units), this was not made evident by the tutor. The tutor focused more on ensuring proper game play (i.e. whose turn it was, how many moves a student made on the board, etc.) than providing instruction and linkage to math concepts that were to be learned by participating in the game. In addition, during one lesson, it appeared that students (and the tutor) were rushed to finish one activity so they could move to the next station and then the next station. The tutor instructed students to read independently but shortly after this students were asked to move to the computer station before they had a chance to process what they had read or receive assistance with reading comprehension (due to the time constraint necessary for movement from station to station, tutor was not able to observe and interact with each student). Although this tutor had a very clearly mapped out lesson plan, he/she was not able to provide the type of individualized instruction or provide the level of guidance necessary to ensure clarity for students because of the time constraints with switching stations.
Time on task is appropriate		2.5			-At one site, students were engaged in their lessons and worked diligently throughout the tutoring session with minimal redirection necessary. Tutors at this site used effective strategies to engage students in their lessons; -At another site, students were on task and completing lessons appropriately in 2 of the lessons, but in the other 2 lessons, students were not always on task. For instance, in the computer lab, students were playing non-educational internet games from various websites instead of working on their A+ Learning System computer program. When reviewers began to closely observe the games students were playing, the substitute filling in for the tutor (there was a sub in the room who stated he/she was not affiliated with the provider but was covering because the tutor was late) encouraged the students to log in to their computer program. Even after this request, some of the students were not on task because they used other students' passwords to log-in and joked about this with each other until the substitute asked them to log on correctly. In another session at the same site, students were initially engaged in their first lesson but when the tutor asked them to transition to reading independently, many students became distracted after the transition and began to socialize or move around the room instead of completing their reading assignment. The tutor did attempt to redirect students but this was difficult because once the tutor began working one on one with a student during independent reading time, other students continued socializing or being off task even after being redirected.
Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable		2.5			-At one site, tutors used effective tutoring strategies to promote time on task and implemented appropriate instructional strategies (i.e. modified correction and adjusted instruction based on student levels). Tutors at this site also utilized effective methods to engage students in their lessons; -At another site, while it appeared that most tutors understood the lessons that were provided to students, not all tutors used effective tutoring strategies. For instance, some tutors did not utilize appropriate strategies to promote time on task (see "Time on Task" section). In addition, some tutors did use effective strategies to ensure students had a clear understanding of the concepts on which they working. Lastly, at this site, some tutors appeared to have difficulty individualizing instruction in a large group session although this appears to be one of the hallmark's of the provider's program as described in the provider's application and

					recruitment materials.
Student/instructor ratio: 4-8:1				X	▮	Ratio is in line with provider application.

On-site Monitoring Visit Rubric
COMPLIANCE Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: Ahead of the Class Services (formerly Spectra Services)　　　　　　**DATE DOCUMENTATION RECEIVED:** March 13, 2008
REVIEWER: S.T.

The following information is rated "Compliance" (C) or "Non-Compliance" (N-C). Selected documentation listed for each component must be submitted as part of the site visit monitoring. If documentation is not available on-site, the director or head of the provider's organization, the site director, or another authorized representative will be required to submit documentation to the IDOE within seven (7) calendar days of site visit completion. **Failure to submit evidence could result in removal from the approved provider list.**

If a provider is deemed to be in non-compliance with any component for which evidence has been requested, the provider may be contacted and may be required to develop and submit a corrective action plan for getting into compliance within 7 calendar days. If the corrective action plan is not submitted, if the corrective action plan is inappropriate or insufficient, or if the corrective action plan is not implemented, the provider may be removed from the state-approved list.

COMPONENT	REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE USE ONLY)	C	N-C
Criminal background checks	**ALL** of the following: -Criminal background checks from an appropriate source for every tutor and any other employees working directly with children.	-Criminal background checks -Some background checks included the incorrect spelling of tutor names and some background checks were completed after tutors began working with students		X
Health and safety laws and regulations	**ONE** of the following: -Student release policy(ies) *In addition to:* **ONE** of the following: -Safety plans and/or records -Department of Health documentation of physical plant safety (if operating at a site other than a school) -Evacuation plans/policies (e.g., in case of fire, tornado, etc.) -Transportation policies (as applicable)	-Student release policy -Student & Parent Agreement -Policies and Procedures for Parents -Emergency plan -Provider did not adhere to a regulation in this area but was required to submit a corrective action plan to address the concern.		X
Financial viability	**ONE** of the following: -Documentation of liability insurance coverage *In addition to:* **ONE** of the following: -Audited financial statements -Tax return for the past two years	-Liability insurance verification -Tax returns for past two years	X	